

Princes Risborough Steering Group transport meeting		
Date of Meeting:	Friday 22 January 2016 2.30 p.m. Committee Room 2, WDC	
Present:	<p>Stewart Baxter Ian Churchill Richard Clayton David Johncock</p> <p>Rolf Van Apeldoorn Charles Vint Jim Stevens</p> <p>Richard Stevenson (RSt) Alan Turner</p> <p>Matt Walsh Ian Parkinson</p> <p>Rosie Brake Ian Manktelow Aude Pantel John Rippon</p> <p>Ulrika Diallo</p>	<p>Askett Society PRTC Risborough Area Partnership WDC Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainability Longwick Parish Council Monks Risborough Society PRTC roll B agent for HS2 select committee</p> <p>Risborough Area Partnership WDC Member and chairman of PRTC</p> <p>Risborough Business Group Risborough Area Residents' Association Planning Policy Officer, WDC Policy Team Leader, WDC Planning Policy Officer, WDC Head of Growth & Development Strategy, BCC Lead Growth and Strategy Officer, BCC</p>
Apologies:	<p>Andy Ball Ian Barham</p> <p>Bill Bendyshe-Brown</p> <p>Dan Brown John Coombs Gary Hall David Knights Ian Moore Dave Maycock</p>	<p>PRTC LEP Partnership manager, BTVLEP Buckinghamshire County Council Risborough Rugby Club PRTC PRTC and WDC PRTC and WDC Princes Risborough School Askett Society</p>

Minutes	Actions
(1) introduction	
RB set out the scope of the meeting	
(2) Transport town centre modelling update - results from Jacobs	
This was circulated to the group prior to the meeting.	

Minutes	Actions
(3) Presentation	
<p>RB ran through a presentation on the assessment made in terms of which option was likely to be deliverable and affordable and therefore make the plan sound.</p> <p>Option 17 shows less of a reasonable prospect of delivery than option 11b. There is likely to be a funding gap for both schemes but in the case of option 17 the gap is much larger.</p> <p>We have asked Jacobs to look at a minimum scheme that will restore a reasonable level of service to the network in the context of dependent development. This will be basis of what can be justified in terms of developer funding and is likely to come close to option 11b. In terms of funding the gap it will be helpful to understand the LEP's position to contribute.</p> <p>IC said that the SG supported route 17 when it was the edge to the development area, but if it goes through it is another barrier to the town for those living in the outer section. Support for 17 was because it was the edge of the development.</p> <p>RB said that the difficulty with option 17 is not only its higher cost (£78 M) but also the fact that it would cross three different railway lines including the Birmingham main line – not only is this likely to mean huge cost but gaining possession of the line from Network Rail is also likely to be an issue.</p> <p>With option 11b there is the opportunity for synergy with the East West Rail project in coordinating works to the Aylesbury line.</p> <p>In terms of relieving the town centre traffic, all options show the traffic reduces below 2013 levels. Option 11b works best for Poppy Road and Askett Lane.</p> <p>JS asked whether the latest modelling was including development traffic – it does.</p> <p>In terms of funding the gap, the PR scheme will have to compete with other priorities across the county.</p>	
(4) Economic strategy for the plan	
<p>AT reiterated his support for option 17 saying that without it, we risk losing a major employer in the town, who cannot relocate at the moment.</p> <p>AT questioned how we could justify future sustainability of the plan as it will fail to improve the economic situation.</p> <p>AT referred to a government statement saying that government money could be coming forward for drainage and road schemes.</p> <p>AT said that Hypnos is threatening to go if they are not</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>relocated at the Princes Estate with option 17.</p> <p>IM said that this doesn't tally with what WDC has heard so far.</p> <p>Penelope Tollitt is having a meeting with Hypnos on 29.01.16 and AT asked to be included so that there is a consistent understanding of the Hypnos position.</p> <p>IM explained that the Princes Estate is ok for commercial development long term – with its current access. If we go for option 17 we need to show by June that there's a reasonable prospect of filling funding gap otherwise the plan fails.</p> <p>MW questioned how the options could have gone from a £26M price tag to double / triple. RB explained that as we did more transport study work there has been a reduction in uncertainties in terms of the cost and the cost has been therefore refined to reflect this.</p> <p>RB ran through the physical specification of option 11b at the request of JS. (i.e. there will need to be space to accommodate a 7.3m wide carriageway, no frontage access through the new development, large terminal junctions with changed priority (A4010 Grove Lane and A4010 Culverton) and improvements to the existing roads and bridges).</p> <p>RC pointed out that one of the issues the plan wants to address is to integrate the old and the new – with a route through the development we would create yet another barrier / boundary. RB responded that the design of the road is the decisive factor here. An edge-of-settlement road, besides having a greater visual impact, would one day be breached and the issue of severance would arise later.</p> <p>AT asked where the plan is at if after consultation residents of PR cannot support the sustainability of the through route. RB responded that risks to the soundness of the plan come principally from whether is it justified and effective – it will not fail for lack of engagement. The bypass options have been given the fairest chance possible, the testing has been extensive and this is the outcome of the work.</p> <p>The steering group wishes to know the position of the LEP with regards to losing Hypnos.</p> <p>A crystal clear position statement from the LEP was requested by the steering group on the PR expansion.</p> <p>Far greater emphasis on the local economy is needed in the plan.</p> <p>RB reminded the meeting of the need to show a reasonable prospect of delivery.</p>	

Minutes	Actions
<p>JR pointed out that the total national funding announced for the LEPs amounts to £6bn which has to cover the whole country (of 39 LEPs) over a number of years. LEPs have to make a sound case for what they seek to bid for and there are a number of priorities across the county.</p> <p>IP raised concerns over the risk of other infrastructure not being delivered due to funding. RB said this is unlikely as other provision is more straightforward to attribute to the developer and comes at a much lower cost.</p> <p>IC asked why we were looking at 2500 homes in an area with little sustainability prospects.</p> <p>RSt said there seemed to be no effort in the plan to create more employment – WDC refuted this, as the plan makes provision for business space in various locations across the expanded town, the Princes Estate being the most commercially viable so that is where the main option is focused.</p> <p>IP said there was an accessibility issue around Summerleys / PR estate and Poppy road. RB pointed out that option 11b improves connections to the station and relieves Poppy Road.</p> <p>MW asked to clarify whether the town gets 15% CIL or 25% without the AAP. It would be 15%.</p>	
(5) Conclusions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DJ concluded that the group wasn't in a position to make a recommendation – two options to go forward in the plan, being careful not to raise expectations / being honest about the issues for each. • Clarification from the LEP was required. Meeting with the LEP requested to be set up asap. AT would like the presence of the three ward councillors at the meeting. • AT requested to be invited to the Hypnos meeting PT is having on 29/01 with P Keen. 	<p>Action RB</p> <p>Action AP</p> <p>Action AP</p>
(6) AOB	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB thanked the steering group for comments received on the draft plan. • RC pointed out that the town plan should say that the well run voluntary bus service has limited scope to expand in the expansion area. This was noted • Town centre improvement figure should specify this is about the highway network / public realm improvements not 	<p>Action RB</p>

Minutes	Actions
the rest of the town centre - noted	